Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Classic Lagrangian may not be applicable to the traveling salesman problem

Michael X. Zhou

arXiv:1405.1298v1 [cs.DS] 20 Mar 2014

Received: date / Accepted: date

Abstract In this short note, the dual problem for the traveling salesman problem is constructed through the classic Lagrangian. The existence of optimality conditions is expressed as a corresponding inverse problem. A general 4-cities instance is given, and the numerical experiment shows that the classic Lagrangian may not be applicable to the traveling salesman problem.

Keywords Traveling salesman problem · Classic Lagrangian · Inverse problem

1 Problem description

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ be a set of cities, and the distance between city i and j is given by d_{ij} (for symmetrical TSP, $d_{ij} = d_{ji}, d_{ii} = 0, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N}$), then the TSP can be represented by the quadratic programming problem (primal problem) [1]

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}) \quad \min \ & f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij}d_{ik}(x_{k(j-1)} + x_{k(j+1)}) \\ \text{subject to } & \sum_{j=1}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij} = 1 \\ & x_{ij} \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Michael X. Zhou
School of Information Science and Engineering, Central South University, Changsha 410083, China.

where $\boldsymbol{X} = [x_{11}, x_{21}, \cdots, x_{n1}, x_{12}, x_{22}, \cdots, x_{n2}, \cdots, x_{1n}, x_{2n}, \cdots, x_{nn}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$, and x_{ij} is defined by

$$x_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if city } i \text{ is in the } j\text{th position} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Furthermore, due to the round trip of TSP, we have

$$x_{i0} = x_{in}, x_{i1} = x_{i(n+1)}, \forall i, j \in \mathcal{N} \tag{3}$$

Theorem 1 *The TSP can be rewritten to the following vector type*

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}) \quad \min \ & f(\boldsymbol{X}) = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{X}^T A \boldsymbol{X} \\ \text{s.t.} \ & C\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{e} \\ & D\boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{e} \\ & \boldsymbol{X} \circ \boldsymbol{X} - \boldsymbol{X} = \boldsymbol{0} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where, $\boldsymbol{e}$ is an appropriate vector with entries one, $\boldsymbol{s} \circ \boldsymbol{t} = (s_1 t_1, \cdots, s_n t_n)^T$ $(\boldsymbol{s}, \boldsymbol{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n)$ is the Hadamard product, and

$$\begin{aligned} A = & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Bigg\{ \mathrm{diag}\Big\{ d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk}, \cdots, d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk} \Big\} \Big(\boldsymbol{e}_{(n-1)n+k}^T + \boldsymbol{e}_{n+k}^T; \cdots; \\ & \boldsymbol{e}_{(n-1)n+k}^T + \boldsymbol{e}_{n+k}^T; \boldsymbol{e}_k^T + \boldsymbol{e}_{2n+k}^T; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}_k^T + \boldsymbol{e}_{2n+k}^T; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}_{(n-2)n+k}^T + \boldsymbol{e}_k^T; \\ & \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}_{(n-2)n+k}^T + \boldsymbol{e}_k^T \Big) \Bigg\}, \\ C = & \begin{pmatrix} 1 \cdots 1 & 0 \cdots 0 & 0 \cdots 0 \\ 0 \cdots 0 & 1 \cdots 1 & 0 \cdots 0 \\ \vdots \ddots \vdots & \vdots \ddots \vdots & \vdots \ddots \vdots \\ 0 \cdots 0 & 0 \cdots 0 & 1 \cdots 1 \end{pmatrix}, \ D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \cdots 0 & \cdots \cdots & 1 & 0 \cdots 0 \\ 0 & 1 \cdots 0 & \cdots \cdots & 0 & 1 \cdots 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \ddots \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \ddots \vdots \\ 0 & 0 \cdots 1 & \cdots \cdots & 0 & 1 \cdots 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

here, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$, $C, D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n^2}$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ is an unit vector with nonzero at position i.

Proof Let define the following notation

$$U \oplus V \oplus W = \sum_{i,j} u_{ij} v_{ij} w_{ij}, U = \{u_{ij}\}^{n \times n}, V = \{v_{ij}\}^{n \times n}, W = \{w_{ij}\}^{n \times n}. \tag{6}$$

In the objective function, the first part can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j} x_{ij}d_{ik}x_{k(j-1)} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{n1} & \cdots & x_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} d_{1k} & \cdots & d_{1k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_{nk} & \cdots & d_{nk} \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} x_{kn} & \cdots & x_{k(n-1)} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{kn} & \cdots & x_{k(n-1)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} \\ \vdots \\ x_{n1} \\ \vdots \\ x_{1n} \\ \vdots \\ x_{nn} \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} d_{1k} & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & d_{nk} & & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & & \\ & & & & d_{1k} & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & & d_{nk} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{kn} \\ \vdots \\ x_{kn} \\ \vdots \\ x_{k(n-1)} \\ \vdots \\ x_{k(n-1)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \boldsymbol{X}^T \mathrm{diag}\Big\{d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk}, \cdots, d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk}\Big\}\Big(\boldsymbol{e}^T_{(n-1)n+k}; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{(n-1)n+k}; \\ &\quad \boldsymbol{e}^T_k; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_k; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{(n-2)n+k}; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{(n-2)n+k}\Big)\boldsymbol{X}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In a similar way,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j} x_{ij}d_{ik}x_{k(j+1)} &= \boldsymbol{X}^T \mathrm{diag}\Big\{d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk}, \cdots, d_{1k}, \cdots, d_{nk}\Big\} \\ &\quad \Big(\boldsymbol{e}^T_{n+k}; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{n+k}; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{2n+k}; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_{2n+k}; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_k; \cdots; \boldsymbol{e}^T_k\Big)\boldsymbol{X}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to rewrite the constraints in vector forms as given in (4) and (5). This completes the proof. □

Without loss of generality, suppose that $x_{11} = 1$, then we have

$$x_{1,j} = 0, x_{i,1} = 0, \ \ \forall\, i, j = 2, \cdots, n.$$

Let define $\boldsymbol{Y} = [x_{22}, x_{32}, \cdots, x_{n2}, \cdots, x_{2n}, x_{3n}, \cdots, x_{nn}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2 \times (n-1)^2}$ and rearrange $\boldsymbol{X}$ in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\boldsymbol{X}} &= (\boldsymbol{X}_1; \boldsymbol{Y}) \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{X}} &= \boldsymbol{X}(\boldsymbol{id}) \end{aligned}$$

where, $\boldsymbol{X}_1 = [x_{11}, x_{21}, \cdots, x_{n1}, x_{12}, x_{13}, \cdots, x_{1n}]^T$, and $\boldsymbol{id}$ is a unique index vector to establish the relationship between $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{X}}$.

To make sure that the objective function value is constant, the matrix A should be rearranged through the following procedures

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{A} &= A, \\ \hat{A}(n+2 : n^2-n+1, :) &= A(\boldsymbol{id}, :), \\ \hat{A}(:, n+2 : n^2-n+1) &= A(:, \boldsymbol{id}). \end{aligned}$$

Let the rearranged matrix $\hat{A}$ be partitioned into

$$\hat{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_{11} & \hat{A}_{12} \\ \hat{A}_{21} & \hat{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

where, $\hat{A}_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n-1)\times(2n-1)}$, $\hat{A}_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{(2n-1)\times(n-1)^2}$, $\hat{A}_{21} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2\times(2n-1)}$ and $\hat{A}_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2\times(n-1)^2}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\hat{\boldsymbol{X}}^T\hat{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{X}} &= \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{X}_1;\boldsymbol{Y})^T \begin{pmatrix} \hat{A}_{11} & \hat{A}_{12} \\ \hat{A}_{21} & \hat{A}_{22} \end{pmatrix} (\boldsymbol{X}_1;\boldsymbol{Y}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{Y}^T\hat{A}_{22}\boldsymbol{Y} + \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{Y}^T\hat{A}_{21}\boldsymbol{X}_1 + \boldsymbol{X}_1^T\hat{A}_{12}\boldsymbol{Y}) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{X}^T\hat{A}_{11}\boldsymbol{X}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the TSP problem can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{P}_r) \quad \min \ & f(\boldsymbol{Y}) = \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{Y}^T A_r \boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{b}_r^T\boldsymbol{Y} \\ \text{s.t.} \ & E_r\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{e} \\ & \boldsymbol{Y}\circ\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{0} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where, $A_r = \hat{A}_{22}$, $\boldsymbol{b}_r = -\frac{1}{2}(\hat{A}_{21}\boldsymbol{X}_1 + \hat{A}_{12}^T\boldsymbol{X}_1)$ and $E_r = (C_r; D_r)$, here, $C_r \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)\times(n-1)^2}$, $D_r \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-2)\times(n-1)^2}$ (the last row is deleted) and

$$C_r = \begin{pmatrix} 1\cdots 1\,0\cdots 0\,0\cdots 0 \\ 0\cdots 0\,1\cdots 1\,0\cdots 0 \\ \vdots\ \ddots\ \vdots\ \vdots\ \ddots\ \vdots\ \vdots\ \ddots\ \vdots \\ 0\cdots 0\,0\cdots 0\,1\cdots 1 \end{pmatrix},\ D_r = \begin{pmatrix} 1\,0\cdots 0\cdots\cdots 1\,0\cdots 0 \\ 0\,1\cdots 0\cdots\cdots 0\,1\cdots 0 \\ \vdots\ \vdots\ \ddots\ \vdots\ \ \vdots\ \ \vdots\ \vdots\ \vdots\ \ddots\ \vdots \\ \emptyset\ \emptyset\ \#\ 1\ \#\ \#\ \emptyset\ 1\ \#\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

2 Classic Lagrangian method

By introducing the Lagrange multiplier $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ associated with constraint $E_r\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{e} = 0$, and $\boldsymbol{Y}\circ\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{0}$, respectively, the Lagrangian $L : \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n-3} \times \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2} \to \mathbb{R}$ can be defined as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\boldsymbol{Y},\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{Y}^T A_r\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{b}_r^T\boldsymbol{Y} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T(E_r\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{e}) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu}^T(\boldsymbol{Y}\circ\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{Y}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{Y}^T A_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\boldsymbol{Y} - \boldsymbol{Y}^T\boldsymbol{b}_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T\boldsymbol{e} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where,

$$A_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = A_r + \mathrm{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\}, \boldsymbol{b}_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \boldsymbol{b}_r + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu} - E_r^T\boldsymbol{\lambda}$$

The Lagrangian dual function can be obtained by

$$g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \inf_{\boldsymbol{Y}} L(\boldsymbol{Y},\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}). \tag{10}$$

Let define the following dual feasible space

$$\mathcal{S}^+ = \{(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-3} \times \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)^2} | A_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \succ 0\}, \tag{11}$$

then the Lagrangian dual function can be written explicitly as

$$g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = -\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{b}_r^T(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})A_r^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\boldsymbol{b}_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T\boldsymbol{e}, \text{ s.t. } (\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{S}^+ \quad (12)$$

associated with the Lagrangian equation

$$A_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{b}_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (13)$$

Finally, the Lagrangian dual problem can be obtained as

$$\max_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\mathcal{S}^+} \Big\{ g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = -\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{b}_r^T(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})A_r^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\boldsymbol{b}_r(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T\boldsymbol{e} \Big\}. \quad (14)$$

Theorem 2 *If $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}},\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ is a critical point of the Lagrangian dual function and $(\bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}},\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) \in \mathcal{S}^+$, then the corresponding $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}} = A_r^{-1}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}},\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}})\boldsymbol{b}_r(\bar{\boldsymbol{\lambda}},\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}))$ is a global solution to the reduced TSP problem ($\mathcal{P}_r$).*

Proof The proof is trivial and is omitted here.

3 Inverse problem

The inverse problem can be simplified as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find} \quad & A_r, \boldsymbol{b}_r, \boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (A_r + \text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\})\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{b}_r + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu} - E_r^T\boldsymbol{\lambda} \\ & A_r + \text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\} \succ 0 \\ & E_r\boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{e} \\ & \boldsymbol{Y} \circ \boldsymbol{Y} = \boldsymbol{Y} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

This a feasibility problem in optimization. To solve such an inverse problem, some degree of freedom should be given in advance. For instance, we can suppose that $\boldsymbol{Y}$ is a freely random "true" solution.

4 Numerical experiments

Now, let consider a 4-cities TSP problem, whose distance matrix is given as follows

$$\boldsymbol{d} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_{12} & d_{13} & d_{14} \\ d_{21} & 0 & d_{23} & d_{24} \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & 0 & d_{34} \\ d_{41} & d_{42} & d_{43} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \boldsymbol{d}_1^T \\ \boldsymbol{d}_1 & \boldsymbol{d}_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where, $\boldsymbol{d}_1 = (d_{12}, d_{13}, d_{14})^T$ and $\boldsymbol{d}_2$ is the remainder, then

$$A_r = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{d}_2 & \mathbf{0} \\ \boldsymbol{d}_2 & \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{d}_2 \\ \mathbf{0} & \boldsymbol{d}_2 & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \boldsymbol{b}_r = \begin{pmatrix} -\boldsymbol{d}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ -\boldsymbol{d}_1 \end{pmatrix}, E_r = \begin{pmatrix} 1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0 \\ 0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,0 \\ 0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1 \\ 1\,0\,0\,1\,0\,0\,1\,0\,0 \\ 0\,1\,0\,0\,1\,0\,0\,1\,0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Suppose that $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}} = (1,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,1)^T$, to design such a TSP problem, $\boldsymbol{d}$ should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (A_r + \mathrm{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\})\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}} &= \boldsymbol{b}_r + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\mu} - E_r^T\boldsymbol{\lambda} \\ A_r + \mathrm{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\} &\succ 0, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

which corresponds to the former two conditions in (15), and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{12} + d_{23} + d_{34} + d_{41} &< d_{13} + d_{32} + d_{24} + d_{41} \\ d_{12} + d_{23} + d_{34} + d_{41} &< d_{13} + d_{34} + d_{42} + d_{21}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

which is to guarantee that $\bar{\boldsymbol{Y}}$ is a best solution, and

$$\begin{aligned} d_{ij} &> 0 \\ d_{ij} &= d_{ji} \\ d_{ij} &\leq d_{ik} + d_{kj}, i \neq j \neq k, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which is to guarantee that a Euclidean distance matrix [2] is satisfied, or more specifically

$$\begin{pmatrix} d_{23} + \mu_1 \\ 0 \\ d_{43} \\ d_{24} \\ d_{32} + d_{34} + \mu_5 \\ d_{42} \\ d_{23} \\ 0 \\ d_{43} + \mu_9 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -d_{12} \\ -d_{13} \\ -d_{14} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -d_{12} \\ -d_{13} \\ -d_{14} \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \\ \mu_3 \\ \mu_4 \\ \mu_5 \\ \mu_6 \\ \mu_7 \\ \mu_8 \\ \mu_9 \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_5 \\ \lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 \\ \lambda_2 + \lambda_5 \\ \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \\ \lambda_3 + \lambda_5 \\ \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & d_{23} & d_{24} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 & 0 & d_{32} & 0 & d_{34} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_3 & d_{42} & d_{43} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & d_{23} & d_{24} & \mu_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & d_{23} & d_{24} \\ d_{32} & 0 & d_{34} & 0 & \mu_5 & 0 & d_{32} & 0 & d_{34} \\ d_{42} & d_{43} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_6 & d_{42} & d_{43} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & d_{23} & d_{24} & \mu_7 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d_{32} & 0 & d_{34} & 0 & \mu_8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & d_{42} & d_{43} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu_9 \end{pmatrix} \succ 0$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_{12} + d_{23} + d_{34} + d_{41} &< d_{13} + d_{32} + d_{24} + d_{41} \\
d_{12} + d_{23} + d_{34} + d_{41} &< d_{13} + d_{34} + d_{42} + d_{21} \\
d_{ij} &> 0 \\
d_{ij} &= d_{ji} \\
d_{ij} &\leq d_{ik} + d_{kj}, i \neq j \neq k
\end{aligned}
$$

We try to solve the above feasible problem (involving all variables $\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}$) numerically by YALMIP [3], but no feasible solutions can be obtained, which may be an indication that the traveling salesman problem can not be solved by classic Lagrangian.

References

1. John J Hopfield, David W Tank, "Neural computation of decisions in optimization problems, Biological cybernetics, 52(3): 141–152, 1985.
2. https://ccrma.stanford.edu/ dattorro/EDM.pdf
3. Johan Lofberg, YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB, IEEE International Symposium on Computer Aided Control Systems Design, pp. 284–289, 2004.